

# Duke University

Durham  
North Carolina  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
304 UNION WEST  
BOX 90928

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council January 21, 1999

PHONE (919) 684-6447  
FAX (919) 681-8606  
EMAIL: ACOUNCIL@ACPUB.DUKE.EDU

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on January 21, 1999 from 3:45 until 5:15 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor **Robert Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

### MINUTES

The Chair called the meeting to order. He welcomed members back from their semester break. The minutes of the meetings of November 19, 1998 and December 3, 1998 were **approved** by voice vote without objection as submitted.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** began by saying that he had an important announcement, namely that he needed input from the membership to help ECAC generate a candidate for the position of editor of the Faculty Forum. The current editor, Victor Strandberg, who served for three years, told him in the last few days that he thinks that three years is a long enough term to serve in the position and thus he wishes not to run for reelection. The election will take place at the meeting on March 25<sup>th</sup>. The Academic Council will receive nominations. He hoped for sufficient interest to generate more than one candidate. He invited interested parties to contact the Council office. He explained that the position carried with it 'a very small stipend,' and 'a little bit of money' for an assistant.

### EARNED DEGREES

The **Chair** turned to the third item on the agenda, the awarding of earned degrees, i.e. diplomas dated December 30, 1998. In accordance with the University Bylaws, he called on representatives from the various professional schools and Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for earned degrees. These lists were presented to the Faculty Secretary and forwarded by the Provost for approval by the Board of Trustees.

Diplomas dated December 30, 1998

Summary by Schools and College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences Dean  
William H. Chafe  
Bachelor of Arts 66  
Bachelor of Science 18

School of Engineering  
Dean Earl H. Dowell  
Bachelor of Science in Engineering 4  
Master of Engineering Management 2

School of Nursing  
Dean Mary T. Champagne  
Master of Science in Nursing 13

Nicholas School of the Environment  
Dean Norman L. Christensen, Jr.  
Master of Environmental Management 9  
Master of Forestry 2

Fuqua School of Business  
Dean Rex D. Adams  
Master of Business Administration 37

Divinity School  
Dean L. Gregory Jones  
Master in Church Ministries 1  
Master of Theological Studies 1  
Master of Divinity 11

School of Law  
Dean Pamela B. Gann  
Juris Doctor 6  
Master of Laws 2

School of Medicine  
Dean Dan G. Blazer II  
Doctor of Medicine 2

The Graduate School  
Dean Lewis M. Siegel  
Master of Public Policy 5  
Master of Arts in Teaching 1  
Master of Science 18  
Master of Arts 35  
Doctor of Philosophy 71

TOTAL 304

Prof. **Steven Nowicki** (ECAC/ZOOLOGY) was recognized to make the following motions: that 1) the candidates for degrees during the Fall Term, as presented by the deans of the University's schools and colleges, be approved by the faculty and recommended to the Board of Trustees, and 2) that the Provost be authorized to make such adjustments to the approved lists of candidates for degrees as may be necessary to assure that no candidate for a degree will fail to have his or her diploma awarded in a timely fashion, or that no candidate will receive a degree for which he or she is not fully qualified.

Both motions **passed** without dissent.

### HONORARY DEGREES

At this juncture, the **Chair** called the meeting into **executive session** to consider honorary degrees. He reminded all present that rules require that all non-faculty persons leave the room for a few minutes, but that anyone who is a faculty member, whether or not they are Council members, is free to stay.

Having gone back into open session, the **Chair** turned to the next item on the agenda, the proposal to add tenure lines to the Women's Studies Program. Presenters are Cathy Davidson and Bill Chafe. He referred members to the relevant materials in their packet of documents: a letter from the Provost, a letter from David Bell, Chair of Academic Priorities, a letter from Bill Chafe, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee plus a supplemental report, a one page sheet with a January 1999 at the bottom. In order to put this item into formal consideration, he would like to read the proposed resolution that will be voted on next meeting. It is a two meeting item; David Bell, head of APC, is present if anyone has questions directed to him at any point. The resolution is: "Whereas a report of the Dean's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Women's Studies recommended that tenure lines be added to the Women's Studies Program, and whereas this recommendation has the support of the Dean of Faculty of Arts and Sciences and has been reviewed and approved by the Provost's Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities, and the Provost and has the support of the Executive Committee of Academic Council, therefore, the Academic Council approves the request that tenure lines be established in the Women's Studies Program and that this recommendation be forwarded for consideration by the Board of Trustees." This, then, is the draft resolution. It will be circulated in writing with the materials for the next meeting and he would now like to call on Bill [Chafe].

Dean **William Chafe** began by briefly explaining the background of this committee before introducing Cathy Davidson to report to

Council and answering questions. Last year there was an external review done of the Women's Studies Program. That program is one that has made a very significant impact on this university, and it's fifteen years old. It had been led since its inception by Jean O'Barr who had done a terrific job of building the program and bringing it to a point of important national visibility. The external review committee recommended strongly that tenure lines be created within Women's Studies and, of course, the Women's Studies Program was supportive of that. In discussions with Academic Priorities, it seemed clear that it would be helpful to get another look at that from people who were not directly themselves part of the Women's Studies Program and could speak to it from the perspective of distinguished scholars within the University who are familiar with Women's Studies, but not necessarily part of the core program. And so he was asked to name a committee to examine three specific issues. The issues were, a) the point of view of the committee on the advisability of creating tenure lines within the program, b) since Jean O'Barr was going to be leaving the program within a two to three year time frame as director, the recommendation for how to prepare a transition to new leadership within the program, and c) in light of the first two episodes or issues, the importance of thinking through some of the long range intellectual purposes and goals of the program. Hence, he asked Cathy Davidson, who was soon to become Vice-Provost for Interdisciplinary Affairs to chair the committee joined by Kate Bartlett from the Law School, Teresa Vilaros from Romance Studies, and Ken Spenner who is chair of the Sociology department. They reported in the one you have before you today ["Report of the Dean's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Women's Studies"]. Members can see he endorsed it enthusiastically and he'll ask Cathy to now speak to it and he, along with her, will be prepared to answer questions afterwards.

Vice-Provost **Cathy Davidson** reported that this summer, and on into the fall, Kate Bartlett, Ken Spenner, Teresa Vilaros and she met and talked about three issues, beginning with the issue actually in reverse order to what Bill [Chafe] suggested. They started talking first about the intellectual vision of Women's Studies at Duke and looked through abundant materials that the Women's Studies department had passed on to her committee. Trying to understand more about the Women's Studies program here. They then went to the Women's Studies program and talked to the members of the program about their own intellectual vision and how they thought that tenure lines might or might not help intellectual leadership and the intellectual agenda of Women's Studies at Duke. They then came back and started preparing this report strongly arguing that not only was it time that Women's Studies had tenure lines, but it was long overdue for Women's Studies to have tenure lines. Not coincidentally, we were particularly urgent at this moment because Jean O'Barr, who started this program over fifteen years ago, has decided to step down as director of the program, and as everyone here knows, when you have a program created by one person and

sustained under remarkable circumstances for fifteen years, there's a large gap when that person steps down. They thought too not only about leadership succession, but support that the University could give to the Women's Studies program as it went to this momentous transition from one leader to whomever the new leader will be. They also thought about different ways that that transition could be helped. In talking about tenure lines, it was felt very strongly that in this late date, there was no way one could recruit or even ask another person to become director of a program as complex and full and busy as our Women's Studies program without also offering tenure lines, not only to that person, but to other persons that he or she might wish to employ in Women's Studies. So her committee strongly recommended the three tenure lines as well as the encouragement of joint appointments between Women's Studies and other programs. Additionally, and this actually came out of an extremely fine discussion with the members of APC, and she thought it was, she was not sure who it was, but it was one of the members on APC who suggested the possibility of a faculty advisory board of eight or ten people around campus that are very committed to Women's Studies who can serve as a kind of transition team as well as a Search Committee for a new director of Women's Studies. Since there won't be enough people to serve as tenure committees for future appointments, even if WS gets three tenure lines, this committee could also serve as a governing faculty of the Women's Studies program and thus give stability in that way as well. Thus they saw all of these things as coming together. Transition to a new director, being supported institutionally, the intellectual vision of the program also being supported by the addition of tenure lines. For her, one of the most convincing arguments that those in Women's Studies came up with as well as her own committee, was that as long as you don't have tenure lines, your dossier cases coming up for tenure and promotion before APT, would render one's work in Women's Studies irrelevant to one's tenure case. Once your tenure is actually in Women's Studies or jointly in Women's Studies, all of that intellectual labor that goes into your Women's Studies work is part of your tenure plot, and is quite legitimately part and institutionally part of that tenure plot, and that she thinks is beneficial not only to those in Women's Studies, but also to the bridges with traditional disciplines and the University as a whole. This would also help insure standards of excellence within Women's Studies and again across disciplines.

Chairman **Mosteller** invited questions from the floor to be addressed to the speaker as well as David Bell, Chair of APC, if there are any questions that might be appropriately directed to him.

Prof. **Edward Halperin** (Radiology/ Oncology) thought it a very interesting report, he enjoyed reading it. There were two things that weren't clear to him. The first is about this faculty advisory council. He is having trouble getting a fix on how it perpetuates itself, who appoints people to it, how you distinguish control of this for its direction between the faculty and its

advisory council. He understands the problem of not having enough people for tenure committees, but having an external committee help as a guide strikes him as a possible problem in the future. Could she help him with that?

**Cathy Davidson** asked if Bill [Chafe] could talk about that? She believed there are some other programs that are operating like this.

**Bill Chafe** replied that he thought that they have experienced [before] the difficulty of not having a core stable group that can oversee review, reappointment, tenure situations, and the advantage of this particular formula is that you create a group of individuals who can provide that kind of stability over time serve in an advisory function to the program, and be able to provide the kind of advice, sounding board and committee for personnel questions that may not be able to be handled with a program with not enough equal or tenured status to carry through review procedures. It is the kind of program or approach that has worked in the past with AAAS, and he and his group believed it's an important kind of institutional modification of its governance structure that will help to eliminate some of the irregularities that have been experienced in those areas where there are too few people to be able to constitute that kind of a core.

**Ed Halperin** had another question which he feared will demonstrate his lack of knowledge about the discipline. There's a description here about Women's Studies as a distinct field of knowledge, and then at the end of the document six areas are listed that are either unrepresented or underrepresented that might be areas for recruitment, and can he help him with what a Women's Studies issue is for the natural sciences and engineering that would fit in this.

**Cathy Davidson** replied that in Natural Sciences especially, there were Biology and Gender that encompass a range of issues that have to do with gender in terms of the sciences. Everything from genetics, to evolution, to eugenics and ideas about eugenics, i.e. in terms of history of sciences. Regarding Engineering, she was surprised to see it in the document when she read it over this morning. This is a document written by a committee.

**Ed Halperin** said that when he read it, he thought exactly what she said. He said, OK, he can think about things in biology and medicine, but in geology, or astronomy or civil engineering as he went through his list, she had him there.

**Cathy Davidson:** Possibly biomedical engineering, she wasn't sure.

Prof. **John Staddon** (Psych. Exp.) said he had a related question. The general criticism that has been leveled at Women's Studies by many, is that it is a sort of political cheering section that doesn't have an actual basis, and the specific kind of question, is

he thought raised in the curriculum discussion earlier, not by him but by other people, [namely] the selectivity in some of the courses in the program. And he noticed here for example where the nature of the program is mentioned on page 4, there's a list of reports [subjects] that are relevant to Women's Studies, Economics, Politics, Law, History, Literature, Sociology, Anthropology, Religion, Music, Art and other bodies of knowledge. But Biology is absent. Women and men are defined biologically. So his question is, what kind of protections are there, or how has her group thought about the dangers of a department which is a collection of like-minded individuals with a political aim, and the second specific aim is what has been done in response to this earlier criticism about the lack of requirement for any kind of biology course in the undergraduate program.

**Cathy Davidson** replied that biology should be there. She would take that as a very friendly amendment. She thinks that's just the lack of a biologist on her particular ad hoc committee. It certainly should be there and is a glaring oversight. In terms of core requirements, it's a quite flexible core. People coming from different areas can have different emphases. She didn't know if Bill [Chafe] wished to address that at all. The issue of politicalness, she thought is one that could be leveled against many different fields. Sociology, is the history of sociology as a discipline, that was the criticism that was brought up against it being accepted as a field, and she thought possibly in the early days of Women's Studies. The first Women's Studies program was founded in 1969. In the early days of Women's Studies, she thought that was possibly a fair criterion. It was political and it was politically motivated. Now there are so many different points of view. It's political, but it's a very complex politics as complex as there is in any other field. For her, in fact, the issue is that what makes Women's Studies a field is precisely that its politics are very complex and are exactly the issue. There are many important theoretical and philosophical issues about which Women's Studies scholars have the full spectrum of opinion, and that for her is what makes the field. Maybe that's just her background in the English department, but she tends to think that unless there is disagreement, the field doesn't exist.

Prof. **Arie Lewin** (Fuqua) had a follow up question. He wondered why three tenure line positions [were envisioned]; he didn't care if it's three, five or ten, he just wanted to know the thought process that went into [this decision].

**Cathy Davidson** said she regretted that the document they originally gave to APC, which had a lengthy appendix of schools— all state schools— whose programs were actually as complex and full as Duke's schools, was not distributed to the Academic Council. Although the COFHE schools typically have one tenure line, the best state programs are larger and much more diverse and complex than most of the other COFHE schools. Of the state universities that

have schools that have the same kinds of numbers of students, and again she apologized that this did not go to everyone, Gender Studies at Indiana has four tenured and four joint appointments, and these, by the way, are the ones that she thought, if there were a national ranking of Women's Studies, would be the top programs. Women's Studies at Ohio University has four tenured, three joint appointments, Ohio State University three tenured, seven joint appointments, Rutgers one tenured, three joint appointments, Iowa one tenured, six joint appointments, University of Washington seven tenure lines, two joint appointments. So there's a wide range of possibilities out there. Again part of what they were thinking about is institutional in the sense that this is a major transition moment at Duke. First of all it was felt very strongly that the person who came into the program as the new Director had to have his tenure line or her tenure line completely within. There was a Newsweek article a little while ago about a Women's Studies program that is now chaired by a man, so she was not just being facetious when she says he or she; but the new director should have tenure, but also there should be a stable community of people with tenure, and three seemed enough to have some kind of critical mass without requiring completely exorbitant resources. She thought when there was an outside evaluation, they suggested four tenure lines. There was another place in the document where they suggested two tenure lines.

**Arie Lewin:** Going over the report and discussing various areas [of academic concern], he noticed the absence of women in business, it would have been nice to mention that.

**Cathy Davidson:** Absolutely. Absolutely, she agreed. She thought from what she is hearing from some of these comments is that there is almost no aspect to the University where some attention to gender wouldn't be something useful to the curriculum.

**Arie Lewin:** Some very interesting social scientists in the past [have written on women in management and other aspects of business].

Prof. **Katherine Ewing** (Cultural Anthro.) That issue of the pronouns that she just mentioned [he/she] led her to think of the question of why, (she knew historically why) the program was called Women's Studies, but in her description a moment ago, what she was identifying was issues of gender as they appear in the content of various courses and issues in various disciplines. Would it make more sense to call the program Gender Studies rather than Women's Studies, so that the idea of a male head of it wouldn't sound so anomalous?

**Cathy Davidson** said that wasn't their charge to come up with a name for the program, but in fact, they did talk about this in her group, and her group was split and they could each argue a side of that question, as has happened national[ly]. A number of programs

that have changed their names to gender studies in the late eighties are now going back to women's studies. She personally liked Gender Studies but she could argue it either way. She didn't think you can talk about women without talking about men in some way. It seems a little odd. That wasn't our charge and she thinks there are valid arguments each way. She has read lots of material [on the subject].

**Bill Chafe** added that, historically, it's important to recognize the way in which Women's Studies has taken on a collective identity within the academy and has become identified with the study of gender, but with that particular focus growing out of an attention to the way which gender shapes our history, but especially the fact that we have never paid much attention to historically at least the ways in which women's roles have been so critical. I was the first director of the Duke/UNC center for research on women, and that was a very important Women's Studies initiative, but I did that as a man.

Prof. **Karla Holloway** (ECAC/African American Studies) said she had two points. One on this matter of identity. She hoped that the titles of Duke's programs and the heads of those programs don't have to match, because she thinks, intellectually, what happens in the substance of a program doesn't always have to match whatever one decides the identity of the leader is. She just wanted to bring a point of clarification to the point that was raised on page 4 [of the Ad hoc advisory Committee's Report] about the nature of literature, sociology, anthropology, etc. [which] is dependent on a statement about understanding the relationship between sex and systems of economic development and distribution, so it does in a way bring into the discussion transitional biology and says how literature, etc. are dependent on that. So, although she thinks the discussion of biology as a field of study in Women's Studies is very interesting, perhaps that's not the [main focus].

**Cathy Davidson** replied that she'll take that as a friendly amendment to the friendly amendment.

**John Staddon:** So long as it's included with something.

Both respondents agreed.

Prof. **Thomas Spragens** (Political Science) provided the following context to his question: In terms of the rationale, one of the key sentences [p. 5, Paragr. 3] is that, "On the contrary, the lack of a structurally stable site within our Women's Studies Program impedes the possibility for a production of feminist knowledge in tune with the demands of new paradigms in the discipline." Can somebody give him a technical definition of what feminist knowledge is and how it's different from knowledge specifically?

Dean **Chafe:** Feminist scholarship is not necessarily feminist

politics as you would identify that within a political discussion of feminism versus anti-feminism. It is essentially feminist scholarship, which can certainly contain a variety of very different perspectives from essentialism which says that all women are alike, to the total difference between different experience, different classes, races, creeds and cultures. Nevertheless, used as a departure point, it is the understanding that gender and the construction of gender is a pivotal way of understanding how society functions and how its resources are allocated. So, he would not necessarily take the word feminist to mean the political point of view as much as a departure point, vis-a-vis the importance of studying women as a variable in all sorts of [contexts].

Prof. **Gregory Lawler** (Mathematics) said that he had a similar question that is like that. He meant that an academic decision is being made here, and he personally has a fair amount of knowledge about all the good things that Women's Studies have gone into in the various disciplines. He personally doesn't have a good understanding of Women's Studies as a field. He read about it in the paper, but he doesn't want to treat that. He means, that there is a good one page description, but he is just wondering if she can give members some place to read some more if they really wanted to know?

**Cathy Davidson** responded by saying that she just was the outside reader for a manuscript that Robyn Wigman who directs the Women's Studies Center at California-Irvine, Inderpal Grewal who directs the Women's Studies Center at San Francisco State, and Karen Kaplan who is a member of the Women's Studies program at Berkeley. All of them have interdisciplinary appointments in Women's Studies, and they and the other people writing for them are people whose careers have been made in Women's Studies programs. These are essays that both exemplify and talk about what they feel they have been able to do by being members of a women's studies program. A specifically interdisciplinary program organized around concerns with gender and how that has allowed them to think things that they might not have thought had they come out of a disciplinary background rather than an interdisciplinary one. It includes a biologist, a psychologist, someone who is trained in sociology; but they actually talk about the way in which their questions weren't particularly answered by their disciplines and they had to make new forms of interdisciplinary knowledge. She'd be happy to send him reading lists, but it's a very very extensive list, and if you walk into Women's Studies, in any bookstore in America, the Women's Studies section is usually embarrassing because it has everything from cookbooks and self-help books, and if you're at the local Barnes and Noble, quite serious.

**Greg Lawler** preferred a shorter selective list.

**Cathy Davidson:** One that just came out that is interesting, that

will give him an overview is a book by, she is terrible at names offhand – she thinks it's Marilyn Boxer. It's a new book on the history of Women's Studies. It also has a fairly extensive annotated bibliography of good books that touch on various disciplinary fields in Women's Studies. She'd say that's an excellent starting point, it's brand new.

Chairman **Mosteller** asked if there were further questions and reminded Council that this is an item that will be considered at the next meeting on February 18. A vote will be taken on the draft resolution and Bill [Chafe] and Cathy [Davidson] will be here at that time for further questions. He would now like to call on Provost John Strohbehn, who is going to talk to Council about the document he hoped all members received, entitled 'Duke University at the Millennium.' It's an impressive and interesting document.

Provost **Strohbehn** hoped that members had some time to look at it a bit. What he'll try to do today is try and go over some overheads fairly briefly, then he'd like to try and relate what's in this document to the campaign in a very very coarse point of view. Then he would open it up to questions and comments. The purpose he hoped was clear, namely to try to look broadly at the intellectual map of the institution and ways in which it can be improved, and he will comment on some steps that have transpired since this was written, and things that are beginning to happen and move forward. One thing engineers haven't learned how to do is always put the buttons on the same place on a piece of equipment. [Pointing at his first overhead]: As he discussed in the document, he went back and really read the indenture, looked at some retrospective comments by Phillip Griffiths, looked at the document about shaping our future. Shaping our future, as members know, is a strategic plan from about five years ago. In trying to think about how to approach this problem, he did look at a number of strategic plans from other universities. He looked at what had been written by others. It turns out that very few institutions have done things in a lot of detail. The one document that he found illuminating was the approach that was taken by Richard Levin, the President of Yale. So he used that kind of as a paradigm for going forward. As members know, he broke it up into four broad areas which really started out because of Levin having broken his up. He started up with the medical and the humanities, and then he kind of petered out. If one looks at Duke, however, where it is positioned today, in the Medical Center and in the biological sciences broadly defined, that Duke is really with the top group. We're with the very best in the country. He did that in part by just comparing Duke with Yale in the various strengths, and the strength really comes from the Medical School, from the quality of the hospital. It's broader than that, however, obviously in the area of ecology, biomedical engineering, biomedical sciences, in areas and departments such as ISDS. There are a lot of areas that are doing work that is associated with medicine, hence if one looks at it very broadly, Duke is really very well positioned in the area of

the biomedical sciences, and the big challenge for Duke is to make sure that that ranking is kept and to move forward. Ralph agreed with all of this. First time. If you look at the future of the biomedical sciences, he thinks one area that needs to be paid attention to is to strengthen the core of biomedical sciences. They are strong, but they are not as strong as they could be. They are not as strong as Yale for example, across most of the fields. But as you look forward, he thinks the two major challenges for the university have to do with the area of genetics and genomes, and that's a major push that the Medical Center is dealing with at the present time, and it's to be one of the most active and broad areas that almost every discipline will have some issues or contributions that they can make to it in the broad area of genetics. The second one is the cognitive neurosciences and brain imaging activity. This was a proposal that had been put forward just as he arrived through a task force that Lew Siegel had headed. It's taken Duke only four years to go through the normal academic processes and the first director of that program on the campus side is actually officially on the payroll now. He'll be here in April, and on the medical side, Greg McCarthy is heading up the Brain Imaging and Analysis Center. This is a really true interdisciplinary area. When Duke was looking in the searches for both of these entities, you found people from the opposite side of the campus in both fields. He looked very seriously, for example, at an MD to head the campus side of the cognitive neuroscience program. The second major area that Levin looked at was the Humanities, and looking at the humanities at Duke, there is tremendous strength in the core academic departments. Departments such as English, French, Literature, Spanish and Religion are all top five departments at the present time. In the second tier, they are not as highly ranked but they are strong departments. There has been progress made in the areas of Philosophy, Art History, and again, using the paradigm that Levin used, he defines the humanities very broadly. So he includes areas such as the library that's critical for the humanities, so the strength of your library is important when you think about the humanities. In places like Yale, they have conservatories, or they have architectural schools, they have museums that have very large collections. So that when we think about the humanities, and we're trying to think about it very broadly, and Yale is very strong across those areas just mentioned. If we look at Duke, there is kind of a focus on the academic areas, and Duke has not put in the same kind of resources or gone in the same direction that Yale has. For example, Duke doesn't have an architectural school, it doesn't have a school of drama, and it doesn't have a conservatory for music. So Duke is much more focused than at least a number of other institutions. There are other areas such as German, Slavic, Chinese and Japanese, where Duke is not trying to have the graduate programs that it has in the humanities. These are areas where we clearly have instruction, we have programs, but they are not ones where we are having graduate programs, etc., and of these other areas where we don't, there is a graduate program (such as we have in music) but we don't have a

conservatory, same thing is true for drama. So, as he looks at the future for the humanities, the first and most important thing to do is to save and stabilize English, and there are a lot of people here working very hard on that at the present time, and members have heard about it, you can read about this in any newspaper. French, Spanish and Philosophy need to be solidified. They are strong departments, but we must make sure we keep the quality and top faculty in those areas. The new areas he is proposing, or new direction he thinks Duke needs to put resources into, is a humanities institute, that when you look, as he has stated in the humanities, Duke doesn't have the breadth of other institutions; and if we really want to retain the best faculty in the humanities, he feels and others feel that there needs to be greater intellectual ferment going on in this area, and a humanities institute is one way of doing that. So working with both Cathy Davidson and Bill Chafe who have been talking about this, we will put the first stage of this into place in the next academic year if everything falls into place as fast as they think it can, but they really are looking to a reasonably small program, it will be a virtual humanities institute. They think there is some real potential, particularly if Trent is closed as a residential facility for students. It may be an excellent location for doing a number of different things, and Nan has asked him to chair a committee to look at the uses of Trent, assuming that the Trustees will go ahead with the residential life plan. So they think there may be an opportunity here because of the residential life issues that are in front of Duke. If Duke can get a facility that is the size of Trent, we will be able to do much more than just have a humanities center in it, or it will be the largest humanities center in the world. One or the other. There are other departments such as AAAS which is very crowded at the present time and they might find that it is also a good location. [The point is] how you get a number of different intellectual groups into Trent if that opens up. In the area of the arts, there was a Task Force on the Arts that Jan Radway chaired. They came forward with a lot of recommendations. The first one was to go forward with the museum. He thinks members are all aware that is now on track. In the campaign, those involved are pushing the museum as one of their primary objectives and there is a very large gift, so they're indeed halfway in the process. There are a lot of other recommendations of the Task Force in the Arts and we need to get back to this topic and give a more comprehensive response to the efforts from this task force. When he looked at the social sciences, one of the things he noticed pretty quickly was, the social sciences in some sense are the most even across the whole university, that is, they are quite strong in almost all of the areas of the social sciences, which is in contrast to the humanities, for example, and the major players obviously are areas such as economics, history, political science, psychology, sociology, but also all the professional schools, or most of the professional schools, and many of the professional schools, also play a major role in the social sciences. The Business school, in

fact, is basically applied social science. The Law school has a very strong program in corporate law. The Sanford Institute similarly contributes dramatically to the efforts that are being made in the social sciences. So, he thinks social sciences are quite strong across the board. They are not in the very first tier generally, most of the professional schools are ranked somewhere around ten, they would all like to try and get up into the five range. His group started having discussions with the deans that are interested in the social sciences, that are involved in the social sciences during the fall semester and there have been about three meetings. And all of the deans immediately agreed that the most important thing that needs doing, if one really wants to bolster the social sciences, is to strengthen economics across the institution, that was their number one objective. There have been a couple of meetings, and we have been using this as a way to get the deans to in fact work together during the time when they are developing their recruiting plans and their strategic plans. So instead of having three or four or five economics groups or entities working with economics they're trying to get a coordinated effort across all of the schools. Thus, in the area of economics, which is the one being focused on for the present time, there is some progress going on.

The other key [areas] besides economics, are interdisciplinary and internationalization. These are two major areas where Duke has put in more effort than many institutions, and it's also critically important to the social sciences. As he looks at the future of the social sciences, Duke needs to try to move economics into one of the schools [that are ranked] top ten schools within the University. If Duke is going to do that, we really are going to have to add resources. We're talking about something on the order of fifteen new faculty. About ten of these would probably be in Fuqua. It's in Fuqua's plans. The other five would be spread out across Arts and Sciences, which would include both the Economics Department and interests that come from the Sanford Institute, and similarly Law has interest in the areas of having a faculty [member]. It's not uncommon for there to be law professors, who are from economics. As a matter of fact, Duke lost one of its best economists to Harvard Law School. [Economists are needed] to generally strengthen the professional schools, Fuqua, Law, and NSOE. When we look at the physical sciences in general, compared to rest of the institution, compared to the ranking, we're not in the same region. They generally are not ranked as highly. On the other hand, if you look at it on a percentile basis, almost all of Duke's science departments are ranked roughly in the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile. So they're certainly not in the top ten. If you look at the situation, it's mostly a resource problem. If you look at the amount of resources generally from the point of view of the faculty etc., it's smaller compared with the schools that Duke competes with than say in the humanities. It's a resource question, it's because Duke's endowment is dramatically lower than

everybody Duke compares itself with. So Duke can't do everything everybody else can with the resources it has. So the question is, which direction do we go? In general, it would appear on the average of the faculty side, around the 56% of the schools in the top ten. So Duke is doing quite well, but it just hasn't got the faculty strength, the faculty sizes of the other institutions we compare ourselves with. His recommendations for the future of the physical sciences is to move them into the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile over the next 5-7 years (although he would love to move them into the top five), then he thought Duke would be doing something significant and definitely making the place far stronger. He thinks to achieve something on that order, we have to add something on the order of twenty new physical science appointments. The resources needed if you want to do that is about five million dollars in the operating budget of the school, or about 100 million in endowment. So, as members can see, it is one reason that Duke started out with the humanities, because you're going to get more bang for your buck in that area than obviously working in the physical sciences.

Engineering, in some sense is more complicated as he states in the document, because engineers in one sense are competing with MIT, which is a university that basically is focusing on engineering. You also have lots of public universities that put a great deal of resources into engineering because they feel it has to help the economy in the state. So the rankings here are not as high as Duke would like except in the area of biomedical engineering, which is a top echelon department. His feeling in there is that we need to get a solid base in mechanical engineering and electrical engineering. These are good departments, but he thinks they really need to be built up and be far stronger. We are reasonably weak in the civil and environmental areas, so we need to look at that area. It is a very strong undergraduate program, however. As he looks at the future of engineering, he really does think that the two cores that are critical to having a strong engineering school are electrical and computer engineering, and mechanical and materials engineering, and that's where Duke needs to focus strongly. He thinks that they have the wherewithal from the point of view of also increasing the size of that faculty again. The unit really needs something like twenty more faculty positions. It's going to be about the same cost as for the rest of the sciences, and he thinks there are some real opportunities for further interaction between Computer Science and the Nicholas School of the Environment for interdisciplinary work. He went into a number of other things in the document, and the only other one he wants to mention is undergraduate education, which he starts out saying is not where it should be. He gave some arguments for that, on the other hand, because of the vote last week and the change in the curriculum, one of his major criteria, or one of the major things he's been concerned about has now been in fact dealt with and a great deal of credit goes to Bill Chafe and Peter Lange and that committee and to the Arts and Sciences Council for doing something which is very

rare for institutions in recent years, which is to increase the requirements and their depth instead of decrease them, and the fact that now we know our students will be going out with ability in foreign language, that they would have had some in-depth experience in the sciences ameliorates one of the main issues he had about Duke's curriculum. There are other areas where we still need improvement. Duke's not there yet, but certainly it's a major step from the point of view of undergraduate education. He has some concerns in the yield area, we're not as strong as we could be or should be in the sense that Duke is about 40% of the students that it admits and come to us versus other institutions which are running 60-70%. So there's an area that if we really want to get the students we think are the very best and that we wanted to get, we want to see that number go up. It's very hard to change that number. He has some concerns about who teaches the students. Are we really getting our best faculty there? In general, it's pretty good, but there are some areas again where we think it could be better. One thing that he hopes does well is the student evaluations, and he knows Arts and Sciences is working hard on that, but in general they don't see comparative data when they see information about how well somebody is teaching, and in general the students are as easy graders as the faculty. They both give pretty high grades. Then he thinks there are obviously still issues with the curriculum in writing in Arts and Sciences. So, again he sees a real positive rise in that area.

He wished to make just a couple of final comments. One question of course concerns cost; he did his analysis without worrying about cost. He figured that was Nan and Piva's job. Then, when he was finished, he kind of tried to add up the money he thought was needed, the kind of resources that would be needed, and it's very rough. It turns out that if you add up the numbers he put into the document, it's about something on the order of 500 million, in order to do, at least to handle a number of things he recommended we pay attention to. If you look at the very rough costs that are projecting, the cost estimates for the non-medical center on the academic side, it's about 325 M, so we've got 500 M that he has put in versus 325 M, it really isn't that far apart. That means that if we really wanted to push with this campaign, the resources are going to be available in this campaign. The important thing is that if we really focus on the campaign and make sure we put the money where it is most needed, then we have a real chance to make a major difference in the quality of this institution. Remember, it's a 1.5 billion campaign, of which 500 million of it is clearly in Arts and Sciences, which means you can at least do 500 million dollars. He could put at least three of those [initiatives] on the table. So there ought to be able to be some movement. His biggest worry is that we won't focus on the core academic areas and that we'll find lots of small projects that each of us has some interest in. And we'll put a little money here, and a little money there, and that we really won't achieve what he thinks we can. He thinks it's very important that in some of the major areas he has talked

about that there is a plan that's actually agreed to and worked through and when we're looking for recruitments, say in the sciences for example, yes we are going to put in twenty new positions, so if you're coming to Duke to be in one of the science departments, you're going to be part of a group that is really going to be able to make a difference. Duke did this fifteen so years ago in the humanities in some other areas, it made a great difference, and Duke has another chance to do it. It certainly won't be exactly this program, but he thinks it's time for that kind of discussion to go on with the faculty, with the deans, and he hopes that this helps to move that forward. Thanks. He'd be glad to hear members questions and point to who he'd like to answer them.

**Katherine Ewing:** In your discussion of social sciences, there seems to be an ambiguity and perhaps an inconsistency in what is in the report and what was up on the screen in terms of number of positions. Because in the report are listed the number of positions being proposed for social sciences and ten are suggested and that includes economics, and on the screen, it's ten excluding economics, and she is wondering where his thinking lies.

**John Strohbehn:** OK. Let's start with economics. He understands that something on the order of fifteen new economists are needed, of which the bulk will be in the Business School and it is in their plan. Something on the order of five will be needed in Arts and Sciences or Law, etc. The reason that sometimes the numbers aren't going to coincide is because Arts and Sciences went through a major effort with the trustees and we're now in the middle of a two tier, and at the end of the two tier program, the dean has slotted some slots. He didn't count those because those are ones he knows are already 'funded.' So there's a difference between ones that were needed to get new dollars, which he focused in some places. So there is probably some ambiguity there and there may be some others. But that is one of the ambiguities. Sometimes he was looking at slots that had to be afforded out of a budget we don't have yet, versus others where he was trying to get the total number. It still could have been ambiguous.

Prof. **Steven Vogel** (Zoology): He read the report with some misgivings. He really thinks people should be reminded that there is a biology, which is not biomedical, no more than is chemistry or physics. And he should remind people that it is just this non-biomedical biology which has about the highest rating of any biological or medical component in the university. This report barely mentions this non-biomedical biology and contemplates no additional resources for it that he can see. Now you ask, why is this important? Well, it turns out that this non-medical biology in Arts and Sciences, Zoology and Botany predominantly, shoulder a disproportionate fraction of the undergraduate teaching load, with the worst staff student ratio in the undergraduate college, with more majors than all other science majors put together by far. And

he would note in addition that we just approved a new curriculum, which he happens to like, but a curriculum that increases this load in some of its requirements, but also contains no specific commitments of new resources to it. Well, we are contemplating a big allocation of resources to the physical sciences, and none to the non-medical biological sciences. At the same time, we're talking about how we want to improve undergraduate education. But denying this component, which is doing a disproportionate share of the undergraduate education the resources to do this, exposes these comments on undergraduate improvement to be platitudinous. Beyond that, the very quality of this area, historically and presently, suggests that we can be trusted to add and to improve ourselves.

**John Strohbehn** replied that some clarifications were necessary here. One, in the way at least he was putting this together, where he said biomedical sciences, he was using it in the same way Levin was, which includes biology in general, that is, just like he did in other areas, he took various pieces and put these all in one rubric, otherwise the other alternative course was for him to try to take every department and try to go down department by department. That was not what he was interested in . . .

**Steven Vogel** thought that they should be listed alongside physics and chemistry, other departments in the Arts and Sciences which are properly science departments.

**John Strohbehn:** Alright. But he did state that he thought the biomedical sciences, which included, when he was trying to write the piece, whether he wrote it well or not, the strength of the biology department in Arts and Sciences. OK. So whether I wrote it well or not, that was certainly what was intended. That's one. Secondly, he is trying to find, in the biological sciences, which he did mention at least in part, in Arts and Sciences are part of the strengths, no question, of what he was calling the biomedical sciences in the broad sense. Secondly, when one looks at comparative data of the number of faculty we have in biology in Arts and Sciences, compared to other institutions that are well ranked, we're actually about parity. If you look at the rest of the physical sciences, they are not in parity. So what he is saying, at least his position at this point is that yes, like any group, you should get some growth going, but he is more worried about the physical sciences at the present time to get them up to the quality of the programs that Prof. Vogel is talking about.

**Steven Vogel:** But the problem here is whether we are more interested in the rankings or in providing the resources necessary to do the tasks that we have to do as a teaching institution.

**John Strohbehn** thought one has to do both. One is you could say the rankings are irrelevant. Some people do. He thought that, in fact, they are important. Prof. Vogel also thinks they are important. So we agree that we've got to make sure that the

important. So we agree that we've got to make sure that the biological sciences in Arts and Sciences are going to maintain the strengths they have and keep going and get the resources, and he doesn't disagree with any of that. So he didn't look at his department in depth because it was a department he really wasn't worried about because of the quality of the contributions it's been making.

Prof. **Emily Klein** (ECAC/ Geology): Given that the targeted growth in the physical sciences is all that is feasible at this time what is his opinion, just his opinion, on how he would target that growth in the physical sciences.

**John Strohbehn**: There had been a meeting with the deans that are involved in the sciences, and he thinks it's very important that a program in the sciences be developed, that is in which most the faculty and the deans are part of and look at the areas where we think we can make some really good bets. We have done that in a few areas, for example an effort has been going on between physics and mathematics over the last three years where we're looking at some of the collaboration in the Center for Geometry and Theoretical Physics. He'd like to see coordinated plans between Computer Science and Electrical and Computer Engineering. He thinks at this stage, it really needs to go down to the next level, just the deans and the faculty to get into this discussion and say this is where the best bets are. He's got his ideas for a few of them and some of them he's mentioned, but he really thinks in general he's putting out here a challenge and the next thing to do is to get the faculty and the deans involved and say where is the meat? Where are we going to put our best bets? He thinks the environmental area certainly is an important one and some steps there have been made, but it's one of the areas he has singled out. He doesn't know of any university that is really looking at global warming issues really across the spectrum. There are some universities that are smart enough to do that.

Prof. **Robert Hochmuth** (Engineering): He just wanted to make a comment on what he thought was a bit of a contradiction. Bob Richardson is quoted as saying, or writing, a central discipline will be civil engineering, a field that was obviously moribund just a few years ago. And the Provost himself writes, for example, that we could consider phasing out Civil Engineering as we now know it and create a department of environmental engineering. He thought that was a bit contradictory.

**John Strohbehn replied that** when he put it in, he knew it was contradictory. So why did he do that? Well, two points of view. And he thinks really the question is if we had twice as much resources as he thinks we probably have available in engineering, then you might be able to do both effectively. Whether we really have the resources to really strengthen electrical and mechanical and rebuild civil engineering is [doubtful]. Again this is a thing

that has to get worked out with the faculty and the deans and decide which way to go. He'd written his part when he saw this and said well, he can just take his part and put them both in.

Prof. **Kenneth Knoerr** said his question addresses the Provost's concern whether the money we're going to get from the capital campaign is going to be used in a focused way or is going to get frittered away. That really addresses whether the Provost as a chief academic officer has the proper amount of influence on how these monies we're going to get from the capital campaign are allocated. He means, he has some sense whether it's true or just perceived, that the Provost has had less and less influence over the allocation of the academic budget over the years than he had at one time. He means, if we're going to try and get a very capable person in that position, that person has to have some discretion in terms of making decisions about how the university is focused.

**John Strohbehn** replied that certainly the budgetary process has been changing since before I got here and certainly there has been some considerable change and that's certainly an issue. It's also true that as I stated in the document, neither the President nor the Provost has a heck of a lot of money under Duke's budgetary system that is easily accessible. He has a fund of about two million dollars which he uses to try to help initiatives, but that has to be one time initiatives because it's two million dollars. But that lets you hire four, five or six faculty, but then you're done. So it's not what you call monies that you have the ability to keep generating new ideas; and so he thinks that's an issue that needs more discussion. Certainly with respect to the priorities in the campaign, he had a lot of input to that. And so he's not as concerned about that. The heart of heart is that the Provost doesn't typically do much fund raising outside of foundations and so you don't have the input to where the money is going to be. On the other hand, he certainly knows that both Piva and the president have a very good idea about where we'd really like to go, and they are certainly pushing for those in general who play a game in the fundraising. Part of it is for example, if we're very very successful with financial aid, where we're hoping to do something on the order of 100 million dollars. That would solidify our need-blind financial aid policy and let us do some things better than we're doing. But it also would free up money. And so that's why he thinks it's important that we have a plan where we want to go, so people are focusing on where they are going to put the money, and then you get the donors involved in that discussion. He thinks Duke's development group does know what we really want to do. Whether they can achieve it is going to depend in part on their strength and also part on what the donors want. And it is an area where triangulation is important.

**John Staddon:** Quickly, he'd just like to endorse Steve Vogel's point. It is certainly his impression from an outsider that people in biology are really punished for doing a responsible job and not

fussing about it, and he thinks that maybe some attention should be [paid to it]. Another question is about social sciences. He is curious about the arguments for elevating economics to the queen of the social sciences.

**John Strohbehn** thought it's because among the deans, all of them feel that it's critically important through the programs that they have that they have a very strong economics faculty in order to deal with the issues that are important. And it seems, that at least from the perspective of the deans, that he would agree with that, i.e. that it is a certain amount of glue. When you work in political science, you get into economics. When you work in other areas, some points [involve economics] and public policy. Public policy has a lot of economics. Yet they are really trying to do policy, but to do policy you have to be strong in economics. So he just thinks it is a really important field and the deans agree with that.

**John Staddon:** the same argument can be made about psychology. If you want to do management, you have to do psychology.

**John Strohbehn:** It was a discussion with the deans.

Prof. **Kristine Stiles** (Art): Just a question about table 4 in the appendix on the national research council rankings. She noticed that Art History, German and Music are not ranked in '82 and then in '93. And she can say that Art history didn't have a [doctoral] program until '92, German didn't have a program until '92, and Music she thinks started in '90. So the fact that they appear to be not ranked when they didn't have a program gives a slightly misleading vision of those programs. Is there another way of representing that material?

**John Strohbehn:** First of all thought that her point is correct. They are not ranked because we don't really have programs where we have enough [faculty]

**Kristine Stiles:** For example, Italian is not on here at all because they don't have a program. So it looks like Art History, German and Music weren't ranked because they didn't have faculty representation, and being one of those faculty, that's a concern.

**John Strohbehn** agreed with her. They should have put in a footnote saying that. It should have been clearer.

**Kristine Stiles:** But it wouldn't be fair to people reading the Report, so in the future we can indicate where the programs began.

Prof. **Steven Baldwin** (Chemistry) wondered in connection with the physical sciences, that one issue that really wasn't addressed was one of facilities, research facilities and undergraduate teaching facilities. Has there been an analysis of the needs across the

sciences in this area and some estimate made as to what it would take, any sort of plan for addressing this sort of problem, if it's a problem, and it is.

**John Strohbehn:** Yes, over the last several years his group tried to go through virtually every lab facility on the campus outside of the Medical Center. So we have done a survey of all of them; maps and tables were created to help with the square footages, the number of people that are in them, etc. The sense at the present time is that there is no major shortage of facilities in most areas.

**Steven Baldwin:** Shortage in terms of square footage? How about quality?

**John Strohbehn:** Most of the quality was OK. The area that has probably the best argument for facilities, is the Engineering School. That is if you look at the number of square feet per lab, including the faculty and a number of graduate students, they are, from one point of view the most efficient or the most cramped. So that in Arts and Sciences, it is uneven. There are areas that are good and there are areas that need attention. The Arts and Sciences would obviously be the LSRC, there's lots of people in groups of really terrific space, and there are other groups that really need more work just in terms of renovation. Square footage he thinks is OK in Arts and Sciences, but there certainly needs to be more renovation work which there is a schedule for, but your timeline is not a very fast one because Duke has only recently been getting the capital for some of the deferred maintenance part of its budget initiative, so that's now at least on track. So in Arts and Sciences, he was right, there are certainly areas in Arts and Sciences that need attention.

**Steven Baldwin:** New chemistry, as opposed to Old Chemistry, but the New Chemistry Building is now over 30 years old and it has received virtually no attention. Things wear out, that's his point.

**John Strohbehn** said that he was correct. There is still some major renovation issues with Arts and Sciences. There are some areas of definite progress as well.

Chairman **Mosteller** thanked the Provost for putting in all the effort to put these ideas together and get the thinking process started. There being no further business before the Council, he asked for and accepted a motion to adjourn.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt, Faculty Secretary